

STAFF'S REQUEST ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION

04SN0201

M-3 Investors LLC

Midlothian Magisterial District North line of Midlothian Turnpike

<u>REQUEST</u>: Amend Conditional Use (Case 03SN0202) to permit a reduction in parking spaces required for Multifamily Residential (R-MF) development.

PROPOSED LAND USE:

A mixed use project to include multifamily residential development containing a maximum of 330 dwelling units and limited Corporate Office (O-2) uses is planned. The parking space ratio for the multifamily portion of the development is proposed at 0.65 spaces for each dwelling unit.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval for the following reason:

The requested parking space exception should ensure provision of an adequate number of parking spaces, consistent with similar age-restricted projects.

(NOTE: CONDITIONS MAY BE IMPOSED OR THE PROPERTY OWNER MAY PROFFER CONDITIONS.)

PROFFERED CONDITION

Parking shall be provided at a ratio of 0.65 parking spaces per dwelling unit.

(Note: This proffer is in addition to Proffered Condition III.A.3.c. affecting all units within the Multifamily Residential (R-MF) portion of the project.)

GENERAL INFORMATION

Location:

North line of Midlothian Turnpike and east line of North Pinetta Drive, west of, and adjacent to, Powhite Parkway. Tax IDs 754-706-3006 and 4831 (Sheets 6 and 7).

Existing Zoning:

C-3 and R-7 with Conditional Use

Size:

17.6 acres

Existing Land Use:

Vacant

Adjacent Zoning and Land Use:

North - R-7; Single family residential

South - C-3 and C-5; Public/semi-public (post office), office or commercial

East - Powhite Parkway

West - C-3 and R-15; Commercial or vacant

UTILITIES; ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING; FIRE AND TRANSPORTATION

This request will have no impact upon these facilities.

LAND USE

Comprehensive Plan:

Lies within the Northern Area Plan which suggests the property is appropriate for general commercial uses. One (1) of the goals of the Plan is to provide for appropriate transition from residential areas to commercial areas through buffers and land use variations. Specifically, new development should be sited with special attention given to potential

compatibility and encroachment problems with surrounding residential development. Given the location of established residential subdivision development north of, and adjacent to, the subject property, as well as access constraints to the site, residential multifamily and limited office uses have been determined as appropriate uses along this portion of Midlothian Turnpike. (Case 03SN0202)

Area Development Trends:

Properties to the north are zoned Residential (R-7) and are developed as part of the Brighton Green Subdivision. Properties to the south are zoned Community Business (C-3) and General Commercial (C-5) and are occupied by public/semi-public (United States Post Office), office and commercial uses. The property is bound to the east by the Powhite Parkway interchange and to the west by property zoned Community Business (C-3) that is developed for commercial use or is currently vacant, and Residential (R-15) property. The subject property represents infill development along an established commercial corridor.

Zoning History:

On May 28, 2003, the Board of Supervisors, upon a favorable recommendation by the Planning Commission, approved a Conditional Use to permit Multifamily Residential (R-MF) uses in a Community Business (C-3) District plus proffered conditions on an adjacent Residential (R-7) tract (Case 03SN0202). A mixed use project to include multifamily residential development and limited Corporate Office (O-2) uses was proposed. A Conditional Use was sought, and granted, to allow multifamily uses which do not comply with the restrictions outlined for such uses in C-3 Districts.

Parking:

Proffered conditions of Case 03SN0202 require that the multifamily portion of the development comply with the Multifamily Residential (R-MF) requirements of the Zoning Ordinance except as specified (Proffered Condition III.A.3 of Case 03SN0202). The Ordinance requires the provision of two (2) off-street parking spaces for each multifamily residential dwelling unit. Proffered as an age-restricted development, an exception is sought to permit 0.65 parking spaces for each dwelling unit (Proffered Condition). Although some residents of this facility may not drive, parking provisions must also accommodate visitors and employees of the development. Based upon staff's experience with age-restricted projects, as well as supporting data submitted by the applicant for similar age-restricted projects (attached), the requested reduction should accommodate both resident and non-resident parking needs.

CONCLUSIONS

The requested parking space exception should ensure provision of an adequate number of parking spaces, consistent with similar age-restricted projects.

Given this consideration, staff recommends approval of this request.



January 7, 2004

Jane Peterson
Chesterfield Co. Planning Department
PO Box 40
9901 Lori Road
2nd Floor, Room 203
Chesterfield, VA 23832

Re: The Crossings at Bon Air- Parking requirement for Age Restricted Muiti-Family Use

Dear Jane:

In conjunction with our zoning amendment application we would like to provide this information to support our request for a reduction in the parking requirement to .65 spaces per unit. The tenants of age restricted senior apartments drive less and are less likely to own a car for the following reasons:

- The retirement community will provide onsite amenities, reducing the need for trips away from the facility.
- A passenger van will most likely be provided by the facility for group outings, doctor's appointments and shopping.
- Adult children of the residents will provide much of the transportation for their parents.

We have complied information from trade associations and colleagues in our industry to determine the number of parking spaces we truly will need. We want to avoid a 'sea of parking', and would like to have as much green space as possible. Our neighbors in Brighton Greens are anxious to keep the amount of impervious are in the campus at a minimum. In addition, reducing the parking will reduce the size of storm water management facilities and create a more residential atmosphere for our residents.

Exhibit A shows that actual parking usage for age restricted multi-family apartments developed by First Centrum in Virginia and Maryland. The range of cars per occupied units is between .33 and .80 with the average being .53. The Arbors which is in Richmond has .5 cars per occupied unit.

Exhibit B is part of a report from the American Seniors Housing Association that was published for age restricted "Independent Living" Facilities. It shows that 55% of residents in an independent living facility own cars.

Exhibit C is part of a parking analysis that was compiled for Kisco Retirement Communities in 2001. It shows the Parking demand per parking unit to be between .56 and .71 spaces per unit, with an average of .62.

Exhibit D is part of another parking analysis done for Kisco. It shows actual parked cars per dwelling unit to be between .24 and .56 with an average of .41.

Considering the data we have collected and the favorable impact that additional green space would have on our community and the surrounding neighborhood we fell that .65 spaces per unit is more than adequate

Best regards,

Adam Garff U

Director of Development

Enclosure (1)

an Den

Bruce Hedrick – Smith/Packett Patrick Francis – Brighton Green

Andy Scherzer - Balzer Kristen Keatley - Balzer

手xh. bir 1

	LIND) ICHI	ROW, LLC INDEPEN	FIRST CENTROW, LEG INDEPENDENT LIVING COMMONTIES	2		
	ACTUAL PA	ARKING USAGE FOR M	ACTUAL PARKING USAGE FOR MULTISTORY BUILDINGS	SS		
		1111120				
COMMUNITY	LOCATION	# OCCUPIED UNITS	# RESIDENT VEHICLES	# EMPLOYEE VEHICLES	CARS/UNITS	S
	のできる。 かんかん かんかん あんかん かんかん かんかん かんかん かんかん かんか					
ARBORS	Richmond, VA	74	36		0.50	
BAY FOREST	Annapolis, MD	116	53		0.49	
CREEKSIDE	Frederick, MD	120	52	3	0,46	
FOREST GLEN I & II	Fairfax County, VA	189	68	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.49	
GARDENS OF ANNAPOLIS	Annapolis, MD	92	54	6	0.68	
GLEN FOREST	Ann Arundel County, MD	95	69	7	0.80	
GREENBRIER	Chesapeake, VA	06	37	4	0.46	
KINGS CREST	Spotsylvania County, VA	91	46	3	- 0.54	
MANCHESTER LAKES & II	Fairfax County, VA	237	73		0.33	
OLDE TOWNE	Gaithersburg, MD	74	45	2	0.70	L
REISTERSTOWN	Baltimore County, MD	80	77	3.55	0.56	
RIVER RUN'I & II	Prince William County, VA	193	201	9	0.57	
SALEM RUN I & II	Spotsylvania County, VA	167	15 19 10 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18		0.55	
TRAVILLE*	Montgomery County, MD	37		8	1.00	
TOTALS/AVERAGE		1652.0	818.0	65.0	/ 0.53 /	
The second of th	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	the state of the state of the state of the state of				

The Independent

Report

American Seniors Housing Association

Filibit B

dressing, injections, and assistance with medications; 31 percent are provided assistance with activities of daily living, 17 percent specifically mentioned assistance with bathing and 6 percent are receiving some form of physical therapy.

AUTOMOBILES AND DRIVING

Sixty-three percent of the respondents own an automobile and 58 percent had driven an automobile in the last seven days (Table 65). Residents in GCRCs are significantly more likely to have an automobile and to drive than the residents of the other types of communities. As expected, younger residents are significantly more likely than older residents to own a car and to drive.

LEGAL AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Insurance. Slightly more than three-fourths of the residents have a durable power of attorney for health care and a durable power of attorney for finances (Table 66). Eighty-four percent have a living will regarding their wishes relative to life-support in the event of a terminal prognosis. Twenty-six percent have

long-term care insurance. Residents of CCRCs are significantly more likely than the residents of the other types of communities to have these legal and financial instruments in place.

Financial Assistance. Thirteen percent of the residents receive financial assistance. Residents in free-standing independent living communities and in those providing IL/AL and IL/SNF services are significantly more likely than residents in GCRGs to receive financial assistance (Table 67). Residents younger than 75 years of age and single persons are more likely than older and married or widowed residents to receive financial assistance.

Among the small proportion of respondents who receive financial assistance, 29 spercent receive help from their families (Table 68), 31 percent receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 23 percent receive Medicaid, 17 percent receive assistance from HUD and 10 percent receive assistance from the Veteran's Administration. Note, however, that Medicaid does not provide funding for independent living housing.

Income and Total Worth. Forty-two percent of the residents had a total annual household

				A Maria Caralla		Sure of the state of the	
Table 65	Proportion Who Have	of Residen Driven in t	ts Who Ow he Past Sev	n an Auton en Days			entage of the state of the
71.049.2		Telegraphic Control			TY	PE OF COM	YTINUM
Driven Own an aulo			0.582 0.632	0.498 0.550	<u>ルサル</u> 0.463 0.526	IL & SNF 0.632 0.719	<u>CCRC</u> 0.769 0.799 L STATUS
	. 1 to the state of the state o			AGE			 Discreption (Fig. 9749)
Driven Own an auto		<u>Younger than 7</u> 0.68 0.72	2 0.669	0.397	<u>Married</u> 0.807 0.871	0,48	0.595
	7.4 1.4	HOUSEHOLD	INCOME		All and the second of the seco	TOTA	L WORTH
Driven Own an auto	< \$25,000 0.495 0.539	\$25,000 to \$49,999 0.623 0.696	<u>\$50,000+</u> 0.842 0.871	< \$50,000 0.505 0,549	\$50,000 6 \$99,999 0.579 0,609	\$100,000 to \$299,999 0,694 0,739	<u>\$300,000+</u> 0.758 0.807



IXL, bit C

PARKING SURVEY TABULATION OF RESULTS Active Senior Apartments, Ladera Ranch

Description: Assigned Parking Spaces Assigned	Mountains NO	NO NO	NO NO	-	Amenations -		
Number of Dwellings				**			
- 1. Bedroom or Studio	136	25	130	119	1	Ì.	1
-2 Bedroom	30	20	13	21		1	
* Total	166	112	143	140		1	1
Number of Parking Spaces (Parking Supply)							
-Visitor	2	7	0		1	•	
- Coyered	9	0	0				
-Uncovered	83	\$	136	•	•	•	
- Handicap	~	4	•				ŀ
* Total	173	93	144	137	1		
Number of Parked Cars (Parking Demand)							
- Peak Weekday	92	79	83	85			
- Peak Weekend Day	8	76	76	82		•	•
* Waximum	93	79	83	85			
Parking Ratios							
- Parking Supply per Dwelling Unit	1.04	0.83	1.01	0.96			
Destring Demand nor Dwelling I Init	95.0	.071	0.58	(0.62	0.08	0.86	0.95

FALL DIF TOPER B

		44.5
2 473	:	TO PASSE STATE OF
<u> </u>		-
		1

Descriptor		Development (For Description See Table A)	nt (For	Descript	ion see	Table A.		Average	Deviation	Percentile	Percentile
	-	2	M		Ŋ	9	1			Confidence Interval**	Intervalor
Residents are "Active" or "Mobile"	, tes	, se	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Parking Spaces Assigned	ž	Ϋ́	2	2	Ę	ş	2				
Number of Dwellings Studio or 1 Bedroom 2 Bedroom	244 312	828	809	ārā	50 £	& C &	8-8	원 1. 6. 6.			
Number of Bedrooms	R	륁	1 50	4	\$	&	8	25			
Number of Parking Spaces Marked Urmarked Sarage Total	រីត១និ	3008	8502	200 B	See A	nmox	¥000	77.77			
Number of Parked Vehicles Reekday Late at Might Mid Day Saturday Kaximum	25 TZ	85 5	하는	888	35X	N & &	% %%	33.588 4.615			
Parking Ractios Parking Spaces Per Duelling Durked Care Sea Basilling	8.55 0.55	0.33 0.23	10.45 0.65	0.73 0.49	0. ජ 6.51	0.29 0.25	0.56 0.56	33	2 3	3	8
(Parked Cars Per Duelling) x 1.05		6.23	25.0	0.52	R	270	0.59	STO STORY	 2	97-D	22.0

